

REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action dated August 24, 2009. The Examiner is thanked for extending the courtesy of an interview on Tuesday, September 22, 2009 at 1:00 PM EDT (10:00 AM PDT). During the interview the Examiner and Applicant discussed proposed amendments to Claims 1 and 10. The Examiner is thanked for helpful suggestions and comments.

Claims 1-6, 8-15 and 17-27 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 1, 10, and 22-25 are amended. Claims 9, 18 and 21 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute cancelled or withdrawn claims in divisional or continuation applications.

The amendments to Claims 1, 10 and 22-25 are supported in the specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0053]-[0056].

Claims 1-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 19, 20 and 22-27 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Bae et al., U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0126143 (hereinafter *Bae*).

Amended Claim 22 includes the limitations “utilizing the memory and CPU for laying out the germs on a canvas, wherein there is no more than one germ for every video segment, wherein the canvas is partitioned into disjoint areas corresponding to the shape of the germs, wherein the shape of the germs is defined by a Voronoi algorithm” and “utilizing the memory and CPU for filling in the space of the canvas between the disjoint areas corresponding to the

shape of the germs, wherein filling in the space of the canvas between the germs includes laying out one or more portions of the supports by assigning a pixel value of a point in the space from the same value as the corresponding pixel of the germ's support when this point is nearest the germ, and only when the germ's support does not encompass the point assigning pixel values of a support of a neighboring germ based on a distance from the point to the neighboring germ, wherein a point in the space is only assigned a background value if no support includes the point, to generate a highly condensed visual summary of the plurality of video segments.” The Applicants respectfully submit that *Bae* does not disclose these limitations. Accordingly, amended Claim 22 is not anticipated by *Bae*.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yu et al., U.S. Publication No. US 2002/0126203 (hereinafter *Yu*).

Amended Claim 23 includes the limitation “utilizing the memory and CPU for filling in the space of the canvas between the irregular two dimensional shape germs, wherein filling in the space of the canvas between the irregular two dimensional shape germs includes laying out one or more portions of the supports by assigning the same value as the corresponding pixel of the germ's support when this point is nearest the germ, and only when the germ's support does not encompass the point assigning a pixel value of a point in the space from pixel values of a support of a neighboring germ based on a distance from the point to the neighboring germ, wherein a point between the irregular two dimensional shape germs is assigned an average value of nearby point values only if no support includes the point, to generate a highly condensed visual

summary of the plurality of video segments.” The Applicants respectfully submit that *Yu* does not disclose these limitations. Accordingly, amended Claim 23 is not anticipated by *Yu*.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 8, 10, 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yu* in view of *Yasui*, U.S. Patent No. 6,081,615 (hereinafter *Yasui*).

Amended Claim 1 includes the limitations “utilizing the memory and CPU for laying out the germs on a canvas, wherein the canvas is partitioned into disjoint areas corresponding to the germs, wherein the shape of the areas is defined using a Voronoi algorithm” and “utilizing the memory and CPU for filling in the space of the canvas inside each disjoint area not occupied by its corresponding germ, wherein filling in the space of the canvas includes assigning a pixel value of a point in the space from the same value as the corresponding pixel of the germ’s support, wherein a point in the space is only assigned a background value if the germ’s support does not include the point, wherein the canvas generated is a highly condensed visual summary of the plurality of video segments.” Since *Yu* and *Yasui* do not teach or suggest these limitations, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 1 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Amended Claim 10 includes the limitation “utilizing the memory and CPU for filling in the space of the canvas between the irregular two dimensional shape germs by laying out one or more parts of the support by assigning the same value as the corresponding pixel of the germ’s support when this point is nearest the germ, and only when the germ’s support does not

encompass the point assigning a pixel value of a point in the space from pixel values of a support of a neighboring germ based on a distance from the point to the neighboring germ, wherein a point is assigned an average value of nearby pixels only if no support includes the point, wherein the canvas generated is a highly condensed visual summary of video regions.” Since *Yu* and *Yasui* do not teach or suggest these limitations, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 10 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claims 8, 12 and 17 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1 and 10, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1 and 10 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yu* in view of *Li*, U.S. Patent No. 7,035,435 (hereinafter *Li*).

Amended Claim 24 includes the limitations “utilizing the memory and CPU for laying out the germs on a canvas, wherein the canvas is partitioned into disjoint areas corresponding to the germs, wherein the shape of the disjoint areas is defined using one or more algorithm selected from the group consisting of the distances between the germs, the distance between the face and the germ and the distance between two or more faces and the germ” and “utilizing the memory and CPU for filling in the space of the canvas between the disjoint areas corresponding to the germs, wherein filling in the space of the canvas between the germs includes laying out one or more portions of the supports by assigning a pixel value of a point in the space from the

same value as the corresponding pixel of the germ's support when this point is nearest the germ, and only when the germ's support does not encompass the point assigning pixel values of a support of a neighboring germ based on a distance from the point to the neighboring germ, wherein a point between the irregular two dimensional shape germs is assigned an average value of nearby point values only if no support includes the point, wherein the canvas generated is a highly condensed visual summary of the plurality of video segments." Since *Yu* and *Li* do not teach or suggest this limitation, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 24 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-6, 13-15, 20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yu* with *Yasui*, in further view of Uchihashi et al., ACM Multimedia: "Video Manga: Generating Semantically Meaningful Video Summaries" (hereinafter *Uchihashi*).

Claims 2-6, 13-15, 20 and 26 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1 and 10, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1 and 10 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yu* with *Yasui*, in further view of Kasamatsu, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,338 (hereinafter *Kasamatsu*).

Claims 9 and 18 are cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yu* with *Yasui*, in further view of *Li*.

Claims 11 and 19 both directly depend from independent Claims 1 and 10, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1 and 10 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Yu* with *Yasui*, in further view of Leow et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,091,969 (hereinafter *Leow*).

Claim 21 is cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Bae*, in further view of *Leow*.

Amended Claim 25 includes the limitations “utilizing the memory and CPU for computing boundary curves between the germs, wherein the boundary curves between the germs are defined using one or more algorithm selected from the group consisting of the distance between a point and the closest border of the germ, the distance between a point and the center of

a germ and the distance between a point and the size of the germ” and “utilizing the memory and CPU for filling in the space of the canvas, wherein filling in the space of the canvas includes laying out one or more portions of the supports by assigning a pixel value of a point in the space from the same value as the corresponding pixel of the germ’s support when this point is nearest the germ, and only when the germ’s support does not encompass the point assigning pixel values of a support of a neighboring germ based on a distance from the point to the neighboring germ, wherein a point between the boundary curves is assigned an average value of nearby point values only if no support includes the point, to generate a highly condensed visual summary of the plurality of video segments.” Since *Yu* and *Li* do not teach or suggest these limitations, they do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. MPEP 2143.03. As such, Claim 25 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 27 directly depends from independent Claim 25, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 25 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the required fees and any underpayment of fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 23, 2009

By: /Anthony G. Craig/
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer Number 23910